# Picking ‘em Up

### I prefer not to debate

I prefer not to perpetuate the existing possible

I prefer not to rank and be ranked

I prefer not to put debate to neoliberal use

I prefer not to be efficient

I prefer not to claim the ballot as my own

I prefer not to deter future abuse

I prefer not to tell you how to debate

I prefer not to learn

I prefer not to debate

### Part 2 is Debate

#### Debate is art. A complex interplay of motion and expression with no fixed content. Yet debate’s scientific rationalism -- rules, rankings, points, and procedurals. All meant to teach us something, to inculcate a proper way to debate, a set of skills or knowledgebase. This normativity is always a view from nowhere – there is no divine debate textbook. Status quo powers – the rich, the white, the male, etc. – cohere to define debate’s identity to privilege some at the expense of others.

#### Finding ourselves in a debate, we acknowledge that we can only work with the tools that we have, but we don’t have to acquiesce. We can render the tools and resources of power inoperable for traditional goals and fully operable for our own uses.
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Perhaps **there is nothing more radical than when a student proclaims ‘I would prefer not to learn.’ Such a statement should** not **be read as** mere apathy or laziness, but rather as **a political rejection of the very logic of learning within capitalism.** **To prefer not to learn is equally a struggle to study—to remain faithful to the** **remnant of our** **profane** **stupidity that always interrupts our knowledge, our certainty, our willful resolution, the perceived necessity of our decisions, and the fulfillment of our potentials**. (Lewis, 2014b, p. 346) **Bartleby**, the Scrivener: A Story of Wall-Street is a short story by the American writer Herman Melville (1853/1987). The central character of Bartleby has been cited by several theorists such as: Deleuze (1993/1998), Hardt and Negri (2000), Rancière (1998/2004), and Žižek (2006). Poore (2013) claims Bartleby, “**has** arguably **become the avatar for leftist political resistance” and the unofficial mascot of Occupy Wall Street** (para. 2). Agamben (1999) cites Bartleby as **a figure of pure potentiality who, when asked to do his job, replies that he would, “prefer not to”— neither refusing or acquiescing to his employer’s requests** in conjunction with his job as writer/copier. De Boever (2006) has suggested that **Bartleby is a living dead character, whose** **job** of copying and checking the accuracy of his own copies5 **has given him no other choice but deactivation from his duties.** **Through this deactivating gesture of unworking** (De Boever, 2006), **Bartleby removes himself from power structures, rendering himself inoperative in relation to the state’s machinery into** aporic **indeterminability and contingency of the moment**. **By embracing im-potentiality without demands or outright denial, power becomes bewildered and does not know how to defend itself.** **In an act against exploitive labor,** Bartleby conserves potentiality**, thus “**making labor **freely** available for **reconstruction or** re-creation outside of capitalist alienation **and surplus extraction”** (Lewis, 2012b, p. 361). ¶ We might find ways to bear our complicity in art education under cognitive capitalism and the knowledge, learning, and creative economies by removing ourselves from art educating in order to declare ourselves inoperative and embrace our impotentiality. With respect to the machine that is art education running as business as usual, this opting out challenges the field as rational, rejecting current common sense and practice in order to explore different potentialities not yet realized. For, **we rarely question the necessity of getting on within the system in which we are already precariously immersed—we need to complete the next lesson** plan, **get** that **grading done, fill in the standards** we are development about standardized testing, make room in our schedule for the art test that determines our merit pay, pilot the new assessment product, be accountable to parents for our evaluations of art students, implement the new standards, and get it done more efficiently with less resources and time. Here, **learning has been put to use for neoliberal logics**. **However, impotentiality invites us to reclaim art education use for other possibilities, so that in studying and playing with current structures, we might devise different uses** (Agamben, 2005/2007). **The increased bureaucratization and vulnerability of the field of art education keeps us very busy and thankful for the employment, but it also** takes time and effort away from thinking through alternatives**, or what could have been if we had made other decisions as a field**.¶ Studying Art Education **The experience of studying**, not as the acquisition of competencies to do well on a test, but **without an endpoint in mind**, is an experience of I can/I cannot, amounting to the paradoxical **embrace[s] of potentiality and im-potentiality concurrently**. **Studying, in Agamben’s** (1996/2000, 1985/1995) **view, is an inoperative activity, a means without an end, eluding measurable and preset outcomes for success** that are **held in suspension.** This gives rise to the following question and answer: **What does studying** therefore **give us if not progressive development, improvement, and measurable outcomes? It gives us** something very simple: **the experience of potentiality as such**. **Freeing potentiality from the demand to actualize itself in socially, economically, or educationally measurable forms means that we are able to give potentiality back to itself; potentiality becomes impotential**. (Lewis, 2014c, p. 114) Lewis (2014c) has termed studying as “the improper or unsanctioned use of **learning as an** ‘**unproductive’ means**” (p. 115) **that** **escapes the logic of instrumentalism.**6 As a form of learning, **it refuses to be managed and commodified**, for, “[t]o study is **to undo** the knot tying learning to the aims of schooling and **the modalities** of measure **that transform** our **potentiality into abstract data recognizable only to the Machine of standardization**” (Lewis, 2011b, p. 598). Nevertheless, **while ends may be suspended in study, activity is not. As the status quo is deactivated, we may now risk the chance for art education, for example, to be something other than it currently is. Study is a space of musing, conjecture, creativity, and play. It does not have to be pragmatic, practical, assessed, or verified by putting it into execution towards standardized objectives**.¶ […**They continue**…]¶ As the art education machine perpetuates, **the maintenance of a withdrawal is fleeting and scary as our roles**, labors, and usefulness as art educators **are deceived and resisted. We have to be willing to withdraw from measuring, accounting, standardizing, and carrying on** within art education today, in order **to enter a space of indecision and inaction where we risk uselessness. To stop the perfunctory deployment of art education under neoliberalism, we need to freeze its logos and be disloyal to its rationality.** We understand this is not a risk all art educators are willing to take. Nonetheless, we again inquire, if given the opportunity, what of art education would art educators abandon, and how might we undertake this decreation (Agamben, 1999, pp. 270-71)?

#### The standardization of education in 21st century neoliberal societies affects debate – what we see as a useful skill or “real world” is conditioned by neoliberal logics that position educators to disallow subversion and alternative possibilities for this space
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Studious Play with Art Education Synonymous with schooling, **standardization has become a totalizing ritual, depleting**, out of necessity, **any activity regarded as useless**, such as play. Bourassa (2011) finds the deprivation of play from schools devastating as **the significance of play [has] resides in its transformative capacity to redefine the educational experience and activate new theories of value**. … Here, **play attains a subversive character in the terrain of neoliberalism**. **Not only does play violate the educational activity of testing, but it also opens up the possibilities of enunciating values that are antithetical to the logics of the market**. In this context **play inherits the status of a tactic**. (p. 11) However, **Agamben’s** (2003/2005) **studious play** (p. 63) **suspends without destroying**, **which throws something like art education into an alternative ontological status**. **This allows for its reconstruction away from accountability regimes and teleologies so integrated into art education within the knowledge society. Studious play may reanimate art education with im-potentiality**. **As studious play, art education becomes deactivated from its current use and value matrices and repurposed for “reinvention, radical experimentation, and radical abandonment”** (Lewis, 2014a, p. 210). We are not calling for this space to make our practices better **or more efficient within existing criteria, instead, we are imbuing art education with** a “sense of potentiality or whateverness **brought forth through studious play without knowing what this potentiality is destined for”** (Lewis, 2014a, p. 210). Those who participate in studious play become tinkerers **playing with and transforming what is overlooked, undervalued, immeasurable, stupid, dysfunctional, and useless within the current priorities of art education, so that they may become something else**.7 **We are not asking to destroy art education—it can carry on just fine without us for a moment, and we do want it to carry on! We are just suspending its efficacy, leaving idle its drive to determine and measure, deactivating its rules of operation, and suspending it into a time-out or limbo** (Lewis, 2011b, p. 595) in order **to, “studiously play with its remnants”** (Lewis, 2012b, p. 364). These **laws, signs, rules, standards, principles, best practices, and objectives become available for free use** (Agamben, 2005/2007) **as they are wrested from their routines, roles, and functional guidelines.** Thus, **norms are inoperative during studious play, “opening up the studier to the potentiality of the world to be rather than it has become”** (italics in original, Lewis, 2014a, p. 203). **Here, art education loses its art education-ness and becomes, “indeterminate without destination”** (Lewis, 2014a, p. 209). **We are using art education differently through manipulating it, proposing other ways to do it and reanimating it without normative pressures for definition and accountability. As a result, its usefulness is deferred, making it its preset confines**.¶ These **instances of potentiality through studious play unlock** our present as art educators to as-yet-**undefined and uncertain futures**.8 In order **to embrace this** betrayal of the current construction of art education, **one has to view the ends and means of art education as irrational, overdetermined, limited, or illogical at some level.** An art educator has **to see his/her profession as problematic and ripe for destabilization.** S/he must be **willing to challenge traditional art education notions in order to place the norms and current arrangements** of art education **under the disruption and possibility of potentiality brought about by studious play.** **Potentiality occasions such a moment of critical pause and suspension of application. This is not meant to cause a destruction of the field, but a deactivation, a disavowal of our customs, and a provocation at points of failure, contradiction, and non-critical conformity within the symbolic order that is art education as usual.**9¶ As the art education machine perpetuates, the maintenance of a withdrawal is fleeting and scary as our roles, labors, and usefulness as art educators are deceived and resisted. We have to be willing to withdraw from measuring, accounting, standardizing, and carrying on within art education today, in order to enter a space of indecision and inaction where we risk uselessness. To stop the perfunctory deployment of art education under neoliberalism, we need to freeze its logos and be disloyal to its rationality. We understand this is not a risk all art educators are willing to take. Nonetheless, we again inquire, if given the opportunity, what of art education would art educators abandon, and how might we undertake this decreation (Agamben, 1999, pp. 270-71)?

### Part 3 is Becoming

#### First is metaphysics – there is no identity; we’re all together
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If you are a poet, you will see clearly that **there is a cloud floating in this sheet of paper. Without a cloud, there will be no rain; without rain, the trees cannot grow; and without tress, we cannot make paper. The cloud is essential for the paper to exist. If the cloud is not here, the sheet of paper cannot be here either. So we can say that the cloud and the paper *inter-are*.** **“Interbeing” is a word that is not in the dictionary yet, but if we combine the prefix “inter-“ with the verb “to be,” we have a new verb, inter-be. If we look into this sheet of paper even more deeply, we can see the sunshine in it. If the sunshine is not there, the forest cannot grow. In fact, nothing can grow. Even we cannot grow without sunshine.** And so, we know that the sunshine is also in this sheet of paper. The paper and the sunshine inter-are. **And if we continue to look, we can see the logger who cut the tree and brought it to the mill to be transformed into paper. And we see the wheat. We know that the logger cannot exist without his daily bread, and therefore the wheat that became his bread is also in this sheet of paper. And the logger’s father and mother are in it too. When we look in this way, we see that without all of these things, this sheet of paper cannot exist. Looking even more deeply, we can see we are in it too. This is not difficult to see, because when we look at a sheet of paper, the sheet of paper is part of our perception. Your mind is in here and mine is also. So we can say that everything is in here in this sheet of paper.** **You cannot point out one thing that is not here – time, space, the earth, the rain, the minerals in the soil, the sunshine, the cloud, the river, the heat. Everything coexists with this sheet of paper.** That is why I think the word inter-be should be in the dictionary. To be is to inter-be. **You cannot just *be* by yourself alone. You have to inter-be with every other thing. This sheet of paper is, because everything else is.** Suppose we try to return one of the elements to its source. Suppose we return the sunshine to the sun. Do you think that this sheet of paper would be possible? No, without sunshine nothing can be. And if we return the logger to his mother, then we have no sheet of paper either. The fact is that this sheet of paper is made up only of “non-paper elements.” And if we return these non-paper elements to their sources then there can be no paper at all. Without non-paper elements, like mind, logger, sunshine, and so on, there will be no paper. **As thin as this sheet of paper is, it contains everything in the universe in it.**

#### Deleuze divides the forces acting upon an object into expression -- all the object’s past – and content – all the object’s potential futures. This warrant is also linguistic. All meaning or essence is reducible to an abstract machine of forces,

Massumi 92

Brian Massumi, A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari, 1992, MIT Press

Take wood.2 A woodworker who sets out to make a table does not pick just any piece of wood. She chooses the right piece for the application. When she works it, she does not indiscriminately plow into it with the plane. She is conscious of the grain and is directed by it. She reads it and interprets it. What she reads are signs. Signs are qualities3 (color, texture, durability, and so on). And qualities are much more than simply logical properties or sense perceptions. They envelop a potential -the capacity to be affected, or to submit to a force (the action of the plane; later, the pressure of salt shakers and discourteous elbows), and the capacity to affect, or to release a force (resistance to gravity; or in a nontable application, releasing heat when burned). The presence of the sign is a contraction of time. It is simultaneously an indicator of a future potential and a symptom of a past. It envelops material processes pointing forward (planing; being a table) and backward (the evolution of the tree’s species; the natural conditions governing its individual growth; the cultural actions that brought that particular wood to the workshop for that particular purpose). Envelopment is not a metaphor. The wood’s individual and phylogenetic past exists as traces in the grain, and its future as qualities to be exploited. On a first, tentative level, meaning is precisely that: a network of enveloped material processes. ¶ “**A thing has as many meanings as there are forces capable of seizing it**.”4 **The presence of the sign is** not an identity but **an envelopment of** difference, of **a multiplicity** of actions, materials, and levels. In a broader sense, **meaning even includes the paths not taken. It is also all the forces that could have seized the thing but did not. It is an infinity of processes**.¶ **Interpretation consists in developing** what is enveloped in **the sign. The woodworker brings the qualities of the wood to a certain expression.** His interpretation is a creation, not just of a physical object, but of a use-value, a cultural object, a table for steak and potatoes. Although the activity of the woodworker may seem to occur on a conscious level as a “will” or “intention” translated into action, it is no more subjective than the sign was merely objective. Only a Horatio Alger would say that it was by free choice alone that the woodworker-to-be became a manual laborer. **The training he received is a particular institutionalization of craftsmanship formalizing knowledge accumulated over centuries by countless people. What product he makes from the wood is defined by the cultural needs and fashions of countless others. Interpretation is force, and an application of force is the outcome of an endless interplay of processes natural and historical, individual and institutional**.¶ This gives us a second approximation of what **meaning is**: more **a meeting between forces** than simply the forces behind the signs. Force against force, action upon action, the development of an envelopment: **meaning is the encounter of lines of force, each of which is actually a complex of other forces. The processes** taking place actually or potentially on all sides **could be analyzed indefinitely in any direction. There is no end, no unity in the sense of a totality that would tie it all together in a logical knot.** No unity, but a region of clarity: tool meets wood. **The meaning of an event can be rigorously analyzed, but never exhaustively, because it is the effect of an infinitely long process** of selection determining that these two things, **of all things**, meet in this way at this place and time, **in this world out of all possible worlds**.¶ At first glance, **this** example **might seem to reinforce traditional philosophical dualities: nature on the side of the sign, culture on the side of the interpreter; objective on one side, subjective on the other**; matter, mind; raw material, production. **None of these distinctions hold. The forces** that brought the wood to the worker and the worker to the wood **are a mixture of the cultural and the natural. A human body is a natural object with its own phylogenesis; from the point of view of the social forces that seize it, it is as much a raw material to be molded as is the wood from another perspective**. ¶ There is, however, a duality in play. The signs in the wood are not passive (“the thing itself is not neutral, and has more or less affinity with the force whose grasp it is currently in”).5 But they are less active than the tool. Their action is slower, their force weaker. They have an encounter with interpretation, and are overpowered. This is not to say that they are an amorphous substance given form by expression. Expression has no more a monopoly on form than content does on substance. **There is substance on both sides**: wood; woodworking body and tools. **And there is form on both sides**: both raw material and object produced have determinate forms, as do the body and tools. ¶ The encounter is between two substance/form complexes, one of which overpowers the other. The forces of one are captured by the forces of the other and are subsumed by them, contained by them. “The value of something is the hierarchy of forces which are expressed in it as a complex phenomenon.”6 **One side of the encounter has the value of a content, the other of an expression.** But content and expression are distinguished only functionally, as the overpowered and the overpowering. Content is not the sign, and it is not a referent or signified. It is what the sign envelops, a whole world of forces. Content is formed substance considered as a dominated force-field. **The distinction between content and expression is not only functional, it is relative and reversible**. **Seen from the perspective of the dominating tool, the wood is a content. But from the perspective of the forces that went into it, it is an expression, of the water, sunlight, and [CO2] carbon dioxide it captured and contains, of the genetic potential it did or did not pass on.** **The craftsman with hand to tool is an agent of expression, but from another angle he is the content of an institution, of the apprenticeship system or technical school that trained him.** A content in one situation is an expression in another. The same thing can be both at different times or simultaneously, depending on which encounter is in question and from what angle. ¶ The fact that the distinction between content and expression is relative and reversible does not mean that it is merely subjective, that we can have it any way we like it. Content and expression are indeed reversible, but the “perspective” according to which one becomes the other is not fundamentally the point of view of an outside observer. It is the angle of application of an actual force. Content and expression are reversible only in action. A power relation determines which is which. Since each power relation is in turn a complex of power relations, since each thing is taken up in a web of forces, the distinction may seem untenable. Complicated it is, but not untenable. The strands of the web can be unwound. We can follow the trajectory of a force across its entanglements with other forces (planing applied to a succession of woods, to different effect depending on the woods’ qualities), and we can follow the trajectory of a thing as it passes from one knot of forces to the next (human body from technical school to workshop). Content and expression are in a state of what Deleuze and Guattari call “reciprocal presupposition.” One does not exist without the other. They are mutually determining. And although they are always mixed in fact, they are distinct in nature.’ Characterizing this distinction as “functional” might be misleading. The model is not one of utility but of struggle -a “hand-to-hand combat of energies.”’ The fact that armies always come in twos at least and soldiers by the brigade does not mean that a battle is unanalyzable. It may not be possible to know at every moment who has the upper hand, but the dust will settle. The distinction between victor and vanquished is real. ¶ It is possible to make a further distinction by isolating the formal aspects of content and expression from their substance. The procedures of the woodworker have a method. This formal organization of functions could be called a “form of expression.” Similarly, the qualities of the wood as raw material, the states they pass through as they become a table, and their condition as end product have an order and organization that could be called the “form of content.” The form of an expression or a content can be separated from its substance, but unlike the distinction between expression and content as a whole, the separation is only possible in thought.” A form -an organization of functions or qualities-is not materially separate from its substance. It is that substance, seen from the point of view of the actions to which it submits and the changes of state through which it passes. This time, the perspective is imposed from outside. The distinction, however, is a useful one. Dominating action (function) and change of state (change in quality) are two poles of the same process-the encounter between expression and content, in which each receives a determination in its struggle with the other. Distinguishing a form of expression from a form of content permits us to isolate that dynamic aspect of both formations at their determining point of impact. Thinking in terms of function and quality and bracketing the substances of expression and content is a way of evacuating the poles of dualistic processes. Rather than two irreducible formations, we have two edges of an interface. If we take the abstraction one step further and look at the interface itself-what happens between the form of expression and the form of content -we get a set of abstract relations between abstract points, the “diagram” of a vectorial field: point (tool) bearing down at such and such an angle with so much pressure on point (wood) that yields to it to such and such a degree. . . . Form of expression and form of content fuse into the form of the encounter itself. We have extracted a unity from a duality. More precisely, we have created a unity that did not exist in actuality. That unity does not suppress the actual duality between content and expression, but exists alongside it, in thought. In fact, far from suppressing the duality, it replicates it. Our unity-in-thought is an expression enveloping the (double-edged) encounter as its content: a new content-expression duality, on a different, this time conceptual, level.¶ The form of the encounter we extract is not a “form” as we normally think of one. It is not static. It is a dynamism, composed of a number of interacting vectors. **The kind of “unity” it has** in no way vitiates that multiplicity -it **is precisely an interaction between a multiplicity of terms, an interrelation of relations, an integration of disparate elements. It is a diagram of a process of becoming.** Bracketing substance is a heuristic device that enables a real “trans1ation” to take place (in the etymological sense of a “carrying across”): the interrelation of relations crosses from one substance (the thingness of tools and wood) to another (the ideality of thought). The dynamism is lifted out of one substance and incarnated in another. Thought repeats the interrelation in its own substance; it mimics the encounter, establishing a parallel network of vectors, but between different points (concepts instead of tools and wood). The dynamism can be rethingified, reactualized, by a further translation, into written or oral language (phonemes or written characters in their syntactical interrelation). ¶ Round Two¶ Meaning is not in the genesis of the thing, nor in the thought of that genesis, nor in the words written or spoken of it. It is in the process leading from one to the other. If meaning is as it has been described here-an interface between at least two force fields, or more specifically, between a form of content (an order and organization of qualities) and a form of expression (an order and organization of functions) -it stands to reason that there can be no direct causal relation between content and expression. **An order of qualities (treeness, various stages of woodness, tableness) and an order of functions (being a person, being an apprentice, being a woodworker, making a table) have such different regimes of organization and lines of causality, and pertain to such different levels of reality, that on close inspection we see that between them there can be no actual “conformity, common form, nor even correspondence.”**’~ **If we try to pinpoint the encounter, it slips from our grasp. The “hand-to-hand combat of energies” comes to a head when the plane shaves the wood. But many things intervene between what has been defined as the form of expression and the edge of the blade: a boss, a body, hands, technique, intentions, the handle of the tool. And between the blade and the form of content: a piece of wood, a customer order, rain, trucks, delivery, a tree**. **As we have seen, each of these elements is itself an encounter between force fields of content and force fields of expression, each with its own substance and form. Our original duality has fractured into countless new dualities proliferating in every direction, each encompassing clouds of heterogeneous elements without number.** Expression can only cut through the fog and affect content by ceasing to be itself. It must become the content-tool in the dominating hand of the worker. It must surrender itself to the cut of the blade. ¶ **If this is true of the wood-tool encounter, it is also true of that encounter’s encounter with the words we apply to it. Another infinite fracturing. Another** interstitial **void, sundering with brain waves and fingers and word processor keys and paper pulp and consonants. The expressiveness of thought getting packed into letters and phonemes, into forms of content which enter other causal circuits: speech, print, and electronic media**. Thought surrendering itself to pen and pixel. ¶ If meaning is a process of translation from one substance to another of a different order and back again, what it moves across is an unbridgeable abyss of fracturing. If meaning is the in-between of content and expression, it is nothing more (nor less) than the being of their “nonrelation.”¶ The non of the relation means that **everything said earlier to support the fidelity of the diagram of meaning can be turned against it.** If the diagram is indeed an integration of disparate elements which nevertheless retain their distinctness, and if it is struck with the same redundancy as the meaning-process it diagrams, but does not explicitly acknowledge that fact, then it is in a sense a sleight of hand. The only way out is to say that the diagram’s deceptiveness is precisely what makes it faithful (and vice versa). ¶ Replay: **What the diagram diagrams is a dynamic interrelation of relations. The dynamism occurs twice: once as genesis in a state of things (tool to wood), and again in ideality (concept to concept).” The diagram [of meaning] combines a past (the working of the wood) and the future of that past (the thought of the woodworking), but it skips over its own genesis - the present of the content-expression encounter constitutive of thought (the unthought of thought).** Actually, the dynamism occurs twice twice: **after being translated into** ideality (**concept** to concept) **it is reexternalized in words** (phoneme to phoneme; letter to letter) **to resume its life among things in a new capacity. The diagram again combines a past (the thought of the woodworking) and the future of that past (pronunciation, publication), skipping over its own genesis,** in this case the present of the content-expression encounter constitutive of speaking or writing (the unsaid of communication: afterthought). In each instance, the elided present, like the in-between of tool and wood, is at any rate a void. In skipping it, **the diagram reduplicates the process it diagrams. The diagram** is false, in that it **contracts a multiplicity of levels and matters into its own homogeneous substance.** But it is true, in that it envelops in that substance the same affect, and because it reproduces the in-betweenness of the affect in the fracturing of its own genesis. **The expression of meaning is true in its falseness to itself, and false in its trueness to its content. Translation is repetition with a difference. If meaning is becoming, it is a becoming-other.** It is the alienation of the same in the different, and the sameness of the different in its alienation from itself. The (non)relation is a separation-connection. ¶ One more time: It is stretching things to say that the same affect is reproduced on both sides of the abyss of translation. The interrelation ofrelations between the wood and the tool bears no resemblance to that between concepts, which bears no relation to that between phonemes or letters: “no conformity or common form, nor even correspondence.” The system of woodworking techniques is nevertheless unquestionably connected to changes in the wood’s quality, and the words that envelop both are unquestionably connected to the bipolar process of woodworking, even if they are separated from it by an abyss or two. It is tempting to call these separation-connections parallelisms.16 They are not: wood and tool are caught in their own circuits of causality and no sooner meet than are separated, one destined to be reimplanted in a kitchen, the other to gouge another wood; and no sooner do the words encounter that incision than they are swept away from both wood and tool, bound for circulation in a book. The separation-connection of translation is more an asymptotic relation than a parallelism. But it is a relation nonetheless. Meaning is the “relation of a nonrelation,”” the meeting, across a bottomless pit, of formations with skew trajectories.”¶ **If meaning is a meeting between asymptotic lines of causality which have no common form or correspondence, who or what introduces them to each other? No one person or thing, but the infinity of forces, some willed, most fortuitous, that made that tree, brought it to that workshop, made that worker, brought her to that tool, made these words, brought them to these pages, made you**, and-perhaps most mysterious of all -induced you to **keep reading** this interminably drawn-out example. **What brings these formations together is the “abstract machine.” The abstract machine is interpretation**. It is **the meaning process, from the point of view of a given expression.** Any sign, quality, or statement, as the trace of a process of becoming, can be considered a de facto diagram from which a formal diagram of the operative abstract machine could be developed. In the case of “meaning” as commonly understood (that is, as restricted to the conceptual or linguistic planes) the abstract machine is the subject of meaning (in the sense of the agency responsible for its unfolding), and the “meaning” is the formal diagram of forces extracted from the encounter in question. **A diagram is a contraction of the abstract machine, which it envelops from a particular angle**, recapitulates on a given level. ¶ **Deleuze and Guattari** occasionally **call meaning “essence”** (Deleuze particularly, in such works as Proust and Signs and The Logic of Sense). It is called that because as the point ofintersection between formations, it constitutes a point of contraction enveloping the entirety of their processes. The word “essence” should not be taken in any Platonic sense. **The essence is always of an encounter; it is an event; it is neither stable nor transcendental nor eternal; it is immanent to the dynamic process it expresses and has only an abyssal present infinitely fractured into past and future.** The essence can be condensed into an integrated graphic representation of a vectorial field -a literal diagram, directional arrows between points (a favorite method in A Thousand Plateaus).” Or, as in The Logic of Sense, it can be stated as an infinitive: to-make-wood-into-table. Or, it can be spun out as the words of an expository analysis. Whatever form its diagram takes, the unity of the essence is always self-undermining. In the infinitive, the essence is resolvable into the verbal phrase “to make,” and the noun phrase “wood-into-table.” Even in its most deceptively homogeneous expression, the essence faithfully marks its own bipolar nature as a fragile integration of two “forms” separated by a hyphenated gulf. It is twofaced, suspended in the abyss looking to both edges at once. From the point of view of the form of content, this two-sidedness appears as an “attribute” (the tableness attributed to the wood). From the point of view of the form of expression, it is an “expressed” (the becoming table of the wood).\*\* The attribute is not fundamentally a logical property assigned by an individual mind to a state of things. It is a real quality “attributed” to (produced in) the wood by the abstract machine, as enveloped in the infinitive. The expressed is not fundamentally a signified caught in an interplay of signifiers. It is a function involving a real transformation. ¶ The envelopment in thought and language of a qualitative transformation in a state of things translates a dynamism onto a level at which different materials are in play and different modes of interrelation obtain. It adds and subtracts qualities, reattributing the attribution. The real transformation it effects is of aspecid kind. A conceptualization of woodworking makes it possible for the process to carry over into a set of verbal or written instructions. These in turn permit the process to carry over into an institutional framework. Institutionalization makes woodworking reproducible (through the training of woodworkers; through their insertion into a system of work in which they can be ordered to repeat the process as needed) and perfectible (through the accumulation and dissemination of technique). The Fm-c 19 infinitive is an especially apt form in which to express an essence: translation on the level of thought and language catapults the inexhaustible complexity of each unique encounter’s conditions of emergence into an indefinite circuit of reproduction and systematic variation. Translation adds another level of definition (de-finition) to an event’s dynamism. It repotentializes it, makes it repeatable, multiplies it. But the multiplication of the event is also its domestication. Its dynamic potential is simultaneously carried to a higher power and dulled, diffracted, captured in a regularizing network of forces. Since the action of this reproductive network of forces is qualitatively different from that of the productive network of forces from which the event arose in all its sharpness, it deserves another name: “power.” Force culminates a boundless potential. It takes the uniqueness of the event to its limit. Power delimitsand distributes the potential thus released.23

#### Because there is no static meaning or essence of a thing, including ourselves, all we can do is resist external definition and domination and affirm our radical uniqueness and constant becoming

Lundy 14 John Lundy. “The Stroll: Reflections on Deleuzian Ethics.” Rhizomes. 2014. http://www.rhizomes.net/issue26/lundy.html

[20] Drawing on Spinoza, Deleuze also argues that **the ethical life is one in which we seek to operate through active forces** rather than reactive forces. [7] **Reactive forces do not allow us to realize our potential, since one remains dominated by external forces**, or dominated by purely reactive forces working against our own power and potential. **Active forces** dominate rather than submit to domination, **free**ing **us to explore the** very **limits of what we can do**. [8] **Here the creative**, affirmative, productive **power of will** and **desire is unfettered**. Just as you can never predict how a stroll will turn out, what the good life looks like cannot be prescribed in advance. One could only say that the good life is a life capable of sustaining an active experimentation conducted with the desiring machines that are ourselves, and an exploration of the limits, in every direction, of our will. [21] For Deleuze, reactive forces negate difference, where the affirmative, active forces would celebrate and enjoy difference. This is far more radical than it sounds. According to Deleuze, **traditional metaphysics has prioritized being. Therefore, even if one agreed** with the thesis **that difference is to be affirmed,** the **agreement with Deleuze would be trivial**, **provided one is still operating within the standard metaphysical paradigm** of being. What prioritizing being means, insofar as difference is concerned, is that difference is understood as a measure of relative sameness. For example, we might talk about different beer. [9] This one is dark and bitter, that one is light and crisp, and another is copper and a bit sweet. But, we can talk about these differences because they all belong to a group of things that have a fundamental sameness: they are all beer, a beverage made from water and fermented grain. For Deleuze, reactive forces negate difference, where the affirmative, active forces would celebrate and enjoy difference. This is far more radical than it sounds. According to Deleuze, traditional metaphysics has prioritized being. Therefore, even if one agreed with the thesis that difference is to be affirmed, the agreement with Deleuze would be trivial, provided one is still operating **within the standard** metaphysical **paradigm of being**. What prioritizing being means, insofar as difference is concerned, is that **difference is understood as** a measure of **relative sameness**. For example, we might talk about different beer. [9] This one is dark and bitter, that one is light and crisp, and another is copper and a bit sweet. But, we can talk about these differences because they all belong to a group of things that have a fundamental sameness: they are all beer, a beverage made from water and fermented grain. [22] If we want, we can even compare beer with very different things like octopi, planets, courage, or justice, because all these things belong to one huge all- encompassing universal grouping called "being." **In this perspective, everything exhibits a fundamental preexisting sameness, called being. This view is certainly intuitive. We normally use difference merely as a relational term. We might say "Dolphins are different than fish because they are mammals," or "Dolphins are different from galaxies because they are smaller," etc. Often, the relationality is only implied. If I simply say, "Larry is different," I mean he is different than most other people. If I say, "My pencil is different," it naturally invites the question, "Different from what?" It is just as if I said "My pencil is ten feet away," which invites the question, "Ten feet away from what?" With respect to the last question, it would certainly seem nonsensical if I were to reply, "It's not that the pencil is ten feet away from anything, it's simply that it possesses the inherent property of ten-feet-away-ness." But that is exactly the sort of radical shift Deleuze wants to make with respect to difference. In order to understand or experience the difference of my pencil we do not need to contrast it with some other fundamentally similar thing.** **Deleuze's thinking is a philosophy of pure difference**, which stresses the fundamental and irreducible uniqueness and particularity of every aspect of reality. **Instead of a fundamental underlying being there is only becoming**—the unique development of diverse singularities. [10] **Realizing and affirming uniqueness—the primary character of reality as difference and becoming—requires freeing our senses from established tendencies. I believe this would mean orienting ourselves to the world, as much as possible in a stroll-like fashion,** wherein **we strive to free ourselves from organizing schemes, extricate ourselves from purposive/rational teleology, slow ourselves down, and allow ourselves to experience the particularity of things and events.** [23] **Imagine you walk past a certain building every day on the way to work. The building is nothing to you; it is simply that unremarkable building you walk by every day. Or rather it is something very specific; its the signal that you are two thirds of the way there. Now imagine that one day you happen to stroll past that building. For the first time you encounter the building outside the context of your daily routine. Since it's no longer a point on a route, you are now in a state of greater receptivity to the difference of the building. It might strike you that this familiar building is particularly beautiful or particularly ugly, or that it reminds you of a building that you worked in before, etc**. That is why, for me at least, my camera helps me move into the strolling spirit. It helps force me to **break** my senses **out of habitual tendencies, and see things in new ways** and see new connections between things. This relates to what Deleuze calls rhizomatics, the idea that **there are always multiple entries to the world**. [11] An object or a thought can be approached in multiple ways and be connected in multiple ways with others.

#### Precludes NC standards and roles of the ballot:

#### A: We can only have value to life when we resist microfascisms – otherwise we’re just a resource or object at another’s disposal

#### B: If we don’t first affirm the creative potential of becoming, we can’t value anything else because we’ve denied our own ability to value.

#### C: The framework is descriptively justified per Hanh and Massumi – all things enact forces on everything else. Constant becoming is inescapable.

### Part 4 is Topicality

#### I contend that young people become. Status quo oppression of young people results from categorizing them as “students” or “workers-to-be” – these normative definitions are illusory because the subject is a multiplicity of forces

Massumi 92

Brian Massumi, A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari, 1992, MIT Press

We need to ask one final question: **What is the subject of** the expressive process of **schooling?** Out of all possible contents, **something selected human beings of a certain age and ability. Out of all the potential in the human body, something selected its capacity to be a docile worker. Out of all the ways a body can be docile, something selected the particular kinds of docility our schools develop.** **This selective agency** is the subject. The subject is not psychological, it **is not contained in any one mind.** It is in the interactions between people. Which is not to say that it is simply interpersonal: it is also in **the technology** that defined the kinds of productive work our docility serves. Which is not to say that it is simply socioeconomic: it is also in **the raw materials** at the basis of that technology and in **the genes** that define the physical and intellectual potential of the human body. Which is not to say that it is material in any deterministic way: genes **result from chance mutation**. **The subject is a transpersonal abstract machine, a set of strategies operating in nature and spread throughout the social field. It is a whole world composed of an infinity of causal lines on countless levels, all fractured by chance.** Although it is a whole chaotic world, **it is our world-and from the very precise angle of the very localized event of a high school graduation.** That event lies in a region of relative stability and clarity. With the proper conceptual tools, we can unravel its several strands.

#### It would be arbitrary to posit a distinction between young people and adults because the nature of both is becoming – we are all young people in the sense that childhood is to build and to play,

Peters and Johansson 12

MICHAEL A. PETERS, pf @ Waikato and Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, VIKTOR JOHANSSON, pf @ Stockholm University, “HISTORICIZING SUBJECTIVITY IN CHILDHOOD STUDIES” Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations

Volume 11, 2012, pp. 42–61

This may seem as a very reasonable idea. However, the view is far too idealistic. The focus on protecting children seems blind to children’s actual circumstances. We live, and have perhaps always lived, in a world where children are introduced to society long before they are prepared to resist the pressures of society, not even the most horrific ones. In addition children have very few opportunities where their voices can have the bearing necessary to be fully involved in society. Thus children ha[ve] neither protection nor freedom and Rousseau’s Émile is in danger of just being a beautiful story, and perhaps even useless as a tool to give children both protection and a voice in society. As long as the Émiles in our post-modern world are involved in society, we rather need a **philosophy that calls our attention to what captures children in society and liberates them from societal oppression**. In short Rousseau’s views are too romanticized and abstract to be plausible since it doesn’t deal with our realities where children already are deeply embedded in society (Simon, 1998). Rousseau’s turn to childhood was both criticized and praised by other romantic thinkers. Schiller, for example, thought of **childhood as an innocent state to which, the poet, the individual and society should return [to] Childhood becomes at once a goal and a point of departure.** **Still this is no** backward **movement to Schiller. The romantic poet and philosopher always lead us forward and thus to a new state of innocence reached through a returning to an ideal state**. As in Rousseau this is a return to a state of nature. However, unlike Rousseau, the romantic ideal of childlike state of nature, as it is conceived in Schiller, is an ultimate end. Also this ideal is not depicted as a frictionless move from childhood into adulthood and towards a new childhood. Rather, Schiller thinks of this progression as something like a Hegelian struggle. David Kennedy writes, **For Schiller** the human ontological vocation is to build – in a dialectical overcoming **of the polarization of spirit and matter, of reason and the sensuous – a “third joyous kingdom of play and of semblance, in which man is released from all that might be called constraint, whether physical and moral**” (Kennedy 2006, p. 54). 47 This is a state where the many antitheses of human life may be synthesized. **It is a new way of living where children’s play [is] represent[s] a harmonious interaction between the self and the world, not subject to the outer world, but at the same time interacting** with **it. “Man plays only when he is in full sense of the word a [hu]man, and he is only wholly a [hu]man when** he is **playing” (Schiller 2004, p. 80). The appeal of the romantic vision of childhood is that it recognizes that even the child is faced with a dialectical struggle between the world and the self. Education is thus conceived as a revolutionary process in which adults return to a state [of] where they can have a playful interaction with the world. This return to childhood is not for the adult to become a child, but for the adult to reactivate her childhood in herself.** The Romantics, like Rousseau and Schiller, seems to secularize the Christian idea that entering into heaven requires that we become like little children (Kennedy 2006, p. 52). Still, such a philosophy of childhood is fruitless unless it pays attention to our historical and present day conceptions of childhood, children’s play and our interactions with children.

#### Finally, the aff rejects and breaks down normative categories surrounding the body – young people can do whatever they want with their bodies – there is no one definition of correct medicine or health

Kriss 14

Sam Kriss, “How to overthrow your own body,” *Idiot Joy Showland*, https://samkriss.wordpress.com/2014/03/03/how-to-overthrow-your-own-body/

Of course, **sport is fascist bullshit. Liberal critics of organised sport like to hone in on its aggression and competition** and the absurd salaries paid out to its practitioners, **but none of this is the real problem.** It’s true that most Olympic **sports are some kind of symbolic warfare** (with the potential exception of figure skating, although there’s still a case to be made against it), but a tendency towards aggression and competition is only a secondary characteristic of the fascist cosmology. **The fundamental fascist vision is one of a cohesive and organic society, a society structured [by] around** the metaphor of the healthy body. **Any politics of the body will by necessity be a politics that acts on the body: the healthy body becomes a regulative ideal, and images of healthy smiling men marching off to the front are suddenly everywhere. This spectacularisation of the body is always present** (millions of people watch the Olympics), **but it’s always also accompanied by the idea that health is good in and of itself, beyond any relation to the aesthetic. Individual health means social health**. In Russia, the connection between the healthy body and militarism is still very much alive; Putin himself is constantly taking his shirt off to ride horses, wrestle tigers, catch fish, and otherwise demonstrate his unparalleled dominion over the animal world. In Western countries we generally prefer to wage war through silent and terrifying robots of death, but as the population grows steadily more obese and work is increasingly an activity that takes place in front of a screen (a screen showing sales figures, a screen showing a Pakistani village about to be obliterated, it makes no difference), **the issue of health becomes a matter of deep general concern. And, as everyone knows, the best way to become healthy is through sport. Sport isn’t dangerous because it encourages competition** or tribalism; **it’s dangerous precisely because it’s healthy**. If there’s a central fascist procedure, it’s the subsumption rather than the sublimation of contradictions. **Class antagonisms are buried in the organic nation, internal difference is either consumed or ejected, all cracks are papered up. The healthy body is a prime example** of this. The ideology of sport and fitness has its roots in Victorian England – muscular Christianity, artificial famines in Ireland and India, the desperate belief that sports will prevent masturbation – but while it reached a kind of apex in the historical Fascism of the twentieth century, it stubbornly refused to die with its host. Left-wing responses to all this nonsense have been sadly anaemic. **The most popular is a kind of body-euphoric self-affirmationism: the idea is that we should embrace all bodies as healthy and all bodies as beautiful. This appears to be a response to the dominant cult of fitness, but really it’s a capitulation to it and a failure to challenge its terms. Fitness and beauty are still good, sickness and ugliness are still bad, but the latter two are shoved beyond some metaphysical horizon. Instead of embracing ugliness in ugliness and as ugliness, its very existence is denied**. The figure of the body is a central concern of poststructuralist theory, and **the academic tendency to refer to people as ‘bodies’** (based on the idea that the person is a fictive construct – after all, the word itself derives from the Latin persona, or mask – and that the only thing we can safely say about someone is that they have a body) **seems to have filtered into a lot of non-academic discourse.** At the same time **the body itself is often instrumentalised rather than examined; this is why there’s so little real resistance to fitness fascism.** It’s there from Foucault. In Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, he writes: The body is the inscribed surface of events […] and a volume in perpetual disintegration. [Our] task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the process of history’s destruction of the body. Foucault seems to have a blind spot when it comes to the body; his approach to it is surprisingly un-Foucauldian. Genealogy opposes itself to the search for ‘origins,’ but **when Foucault discusses the body as a site of scarring and crumbling, he implies the existence of an originary unscarred and unimprinted body; a body that’s perfect and primordial and pristine. There’s no such thing: a newborn baby is bloodied and screaming.** It’s necessary to admit that **there is no primordial unitary body, that the thing we call the body is nothing more than the collection of scars that constitutes our experience of it. There’s only a series of metamorphoses without aim or origin, and the healthy body is only another kind of deformation**.

The overthrow of the body is a matter of urgency**, because things aren’t going well.** The new Ukrainian government includes six ministers from the neofascist Svoboda party. Russian soldiers are surrounding military bases in Crimea. The year ends in fourteen, idiots are in charge across Europe, and two global alliance systems are squaring off as Slavic nationalists do their best to rile up a great power. **In the end it’s about language, the filthy habit of humanity**. If your throat coughs up a hard g sound like a Russian then you’re shunted to one side, if you wheeze an h like a Ukrainian you’re on the other. **The shame that periodically surrounds the body tends to be centred on** shitting and pissing and fucking, because these **acts [that] remind us that the body isn’t a unitary entity closed off from its environment; really it’s speech that’s disgusting, because it lets us pretend that [there]** it **is.** The idea of an organic and discrete Ukraine and an organic and discrete Russia is dependent on the metaphor of **an organic and discrete body**. Irredentism echoes Foucault: history has effected a crumbling-away of the national body, but **rather than just uncovering this body they want to restore it. The mad advocates of health and fitness have nuclear weapons at their disposal. If humanity is to survive the coming century, we all need to start smoking heavily**.

### 1AR (Specific to the round I Was in )

#### Massumi takes out theory

There is no one way to debate. Theory attempts to define debate, confine it to one meaning, but that’s impossible since debate’s meaning is always contingent and changing even in the act of reading theory. That means a) theory is incoherent and impossible to evaluate and b) you create a regress in reading it because we have to reevaluate what debate means post- our evaluation of theory, but that evaluation requires evaluation and so on.

#### Massumi takes out T

The language in the resolution is shaped by social forces, even this debate round. Reject topicality on face because it says there’s 1 meaning. You can’t read T without answering my conception of language. I can interpret the rez differently than you and there’s no best interp.

#### Takes out CPs/Ks

Extend that debate is art contextualized by Kalin and Barney 14 – it’s not about competing advocacy. Mutual exclusivity is a lie – the aff is wholly compatible with their advocacy if you take debate to be an activity of creation. They had to answer my model of debate to get access to competition, but I’ve impact-turned competition, so you can vote on the perm.

#### Takes out theory [[you should ask ‘what is fairness’ etc. in cx too]]

Extend that debate is art – that’s Kalin and Barney 14 – I defend that debate is a creative activity for expanding our minds, values and ideas. Fairness presumes that debate is a game and all we care about is wins and losses and that the judge is a referee – all those features assume a model of debate that I’ve EXPLICITLY rejected in the 1AC. If debate is art, theory has no impact.

### K block

Perm consider the alt as a part of studious play, solves better only once we have escaped neolib logic can we think about alternatives.

Aff is a perquisite, a) status quo defintions of debate and identity destroy out own value, they write scripts that tell us how to behave, which destroys any motivation for doing the alt

Case outweighs, neolib treats people as objects that’s dehumanization, that will cause extinction

### Extension of Affect

#### Independent voter – Kalin and Barney 14 say that neoliberalism has coopted education and that current metrics are constructed as rational and logical. To believe there must be an IMPACT and a REASON to vote is an extension of neoliberalism’s endless consumerism. Instead of consuming our labor and resources as valuable as a means to an end, the judge can vote aff on the emotive content of the 1AC. Make your vote illogical, irrational and affective to resist neoliberalism. Extend the poem. It’s a voter.

#### Identity should become multiple—where the tree of identitarian totality once stood, thousands of molecular identities should sprout.

Saldanha ‘6 /Arun, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, Environment, and Society, University of Minnesota and Senior Lecturer of Social Sustainability at Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, “Reontologising race: the machinic geography of phenotype”, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2006, volume 24, pages 9-24, DOI:10.1068/d61j/

Every time phenotype makes another machinic connection, there is a stutter. Every time bodies are further entrenched in segregation, however brutal, there needs to be an affective investment of some sort. This is the ruptural moment in which to intervene. Race should not be eliminated, but proliferated, its many energies directed at multiplying racial differences so as to render them joyfully cacophonic. Many in American critical race theory also argue against a utopian transcendence of race, taking from W E B Du Bois and pragmatism a reflexive, sometimes strategically nationalist attitude towards racial embodiment (compare Outlaw, 1996; Shuford, 2001; Winant, 2004). What is needed is an affirmation of race's creativity and virtuality: what race can be. Race need not be about order and oppression, it can be wild, far-from-equilibrium, liberatory. It is not that everyone becomes completely Brownian (or brown!), completely similar, or completely unique. It is just that white supremacism becomes strenuous as many populations start harbouring a similar economic, technological, cultural productivity as whites do now, linking all sorts of bodies with all sorts of wealth and all sorts of ways of life. That is, race exists in its true mode when it is no longer stifled by racism. ``The race-tribe exists only at the level of an oppressed race, and in the name of the oppression it suffers; there is no race but inferior, minoritarian; there is no dominant race; a race is defined not by its purity but rather by the impurity conferred upon it by a system of domination. Bastard and mixed-blood are the true names of race” (Deleuze and Guattari, [1980] 1987, page 379). In ``A thousand tiny sexes'', Grosz (1994b) follows a well-known passage of Deleuze and Guattari to argue for non-Hegelian, indeed protohuman feminism that utilises lines of flight of the gender assemblage to combat heterosexist patriarchy. ``If we consider the great binary aggregates, such as the sexes or classes, it is evident that they also cross over into molecular assemblages of a different nature, and that there is a double reciprocal dependency between them. For the two sexes imply a multiplicity of molecular combinations bringing into play not only the man in the woman and the woman in the man, but the relation of each to the animal, the plant, etc.: a thousand tiny sexes'' (Deleuze and Guattari, [1980] 1987, page 213). Similarly, the molecularisation of race would consist in its breaking up into a thousand tiny races. It is from here that cosmopolitanism should start: the pleasure, curiosity, and concern in encountering a multiplicity of corporeal fragments outside of common-sense taxonomies. ``We walk the streets among hundreds of people whose patterns of lips, breasts, and genital organs we divine; they seem to us equivalent and interchangeable. Then something snares our attention: a dimple speckled with freckles on the cheek of a woman; a steel choker around the throat of a man in a business suit; a gold ring in the punctured nipple on the hard chest of a deliveryman; a big raw fist in the delicate hand of a schoolgirl; a live python coiled about the neck of a lean, lanky adolescent with coal-black skin. Signs of clandestine disorder in the uniformed and coded crowds'' (Lingis, 2000, page 142). Machinism against racism builds upon a gradual, fragmented, and shifting sense of corporeal difference, that of course extends far further than the street. Responsibility, activism, and antiracist policy will follow only from feeling and understanding the geographical differentials that exist between many different kinds of bodies: between a Jew and a black soldier, between a woman in the Sahel and a woman in Wall Street, between a Peruvian peasant and a Chinese journalist. A machinic politics of race takes into account the real barriers to mobility and imagination that exist in different places; cosmopolitanism has to be invented, not imposed. It may seem that machinism is as utopian and open ended as Gilroy's transcendent antiracism. It is not, because it is empirical, immanent, and pragmatic. The machinic geography of phenotype shows that racism differs from place to place, and cannot be overcome in any simple way. It shows that white supremacy can subside only by changing the rules of education, or the financial sector, or the arms trade, or the pharmaceutical industry, or whatever. For machinic politics, the cultural studies preoccupations with apology, recognition, politically correct language and reconsiliation, or else cultural hybridity, pastiche, and ambivalence, threaten to stand in the way of really doing something about the global structures of racism. A thousand tiny races can be made only if it is acknowledged that racism is a material, inclusive series of events, a viscous geography which cannot be `signified away'. Miscegenation, openness to strangers, exoticism in art, and experimentations with whiteness can certainly help. But ultimately cosmpolitanism without critique and intervention remains complacent with its own comfortably mobile position. In a word, ethics encompasses politics, and politics starts with convincing people of race's materiality Close With racism enduring every well-meant attack (it's arbitrary! it's arbitrary!), it seems crucial for the humanities and social sciences to start engaging with the reality of phenotype phenotype itself, unmediated, in all of its connective glory. Following recent turns towards embodiment and materiality, the mediation model as endorsed by Butler and many in race and ethnic studies becomes inadequate to understand processes of racialisation. Race is not only a problem of how people think about skin colour. We need to know what race really is, that is, what it can be. Deontologising race, as Gilroy wishes to do, even if possible, seems a bad option if all the ontological questions are left to reductionist sociobiologists and far-right politicians to answer. As Haraway's writings attest, social scientists and cultural theorists cannot let multinationals and the sensationalist science press `do' all the biology. There is simply too much at stake to continue brushing aside the biological as `discursive practice'. Haraway's project, like Latour's, nonetheless remains too epistemological (science studies). With the profusion of popular science books and television programmes on `human nature', and this in conjunction with growing xenophobia, the public sphere is craving for critical social science interventions addressing these issues, not as mate- rial ^ semiotic constructions, but as debatable empirical, political and philosophical findings. Race is completely contingent, but not arbitrary: in hindsight, its differentiations and inequalities can be explained (Winant, 2004). A process such as race clearly cannot be studied with classical notions of identity, causality, cogito, representation, and reducibility. As a configuration made viscous by a whole host of processes, race requires genetics and ethnography and economics and literary theory to be understood. And a critical dialogue between the humanities and the physical sciences will be greatly facilitated by the nonmodern ontology of complexity theory. I discussed several entry points into such a pluralist ontological understanding of race. One is the phenomenology of race, provided it keeps the focus on embodied, social interaction, in which an ethics of responsibility follows from sensing the inten- sities between oneself and others, however distant. Another is the political appraisal of difference in corporeal feminism. Anthropology is a third entry point, at least if eased from the epistemological and imperialist straightjackets of modernity. Biology, as inaugurated by Darwin, is a contextual and nuanced way of understanding the intrinsic vitality of matter. Deleuze's metaphysics of difference and repetition, finally, gives philosophical valence to the scientific project of understanding the emergence of race and the political project of striving for the freedom of more bodies. Race shows the openness of the body, the way organisms connect to their environment and establish uneven relationships amongst each other. The creativity of nature is not good in itself, but it can be made good. The molecular energies of race can be sensed, understood, and harnessed to crumble the systemic violence currently keeping bodies in place. Hoping for, striving for a thousand tiny races is not annihilating nature from culture, but on the contrary, immersing oneself in nature's lines of flight. This politics is also not mystical or anarchistic, it is pragmatic and includes state policy as well as what Deleuze and Guattari call micropolitics. It is first of all empirical: understand what race is, know its potentialities, try to sense them hiding around you, find out what is keeping them from becoming actual.